

REMARKS

In the ***final*** Office Action mailed March 18, 2010 the Office noted that claims 1-20 were pending and rejected claims 1-20. In this amendment claims 1 and 10 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Lagosanto, U.S. Patent No. 6,807,561 in view of Zuppicich, U.S. Patent No. 6,698,654. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Lagosanto discusses a method for communicating messages between a client application within a terminal and an application within a smart card. This method implements a proxy in the terminal and a corresponding skeleton in the smart card, to operate corresponding translations between method calls and APDU messages. As discusses in Lagosanto, the method calls are known from both applications (in the terminal and in the smart card) and a translation of these calls is performed to comply with APDU communication protocol between the terminal and the smart card.

In this respect, the method calls are used locally (within the smart card) to address and execute any data object (e.g. Java object) and also known from the client application of the terminal since the method are published (Lagosanto col. 6, line 35). In use, the APDU messages corresponding to specific method calls only enables obtaining the response of said method.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Lagosanto does not disclose "at least one data object ***associated to at least one first reference local to the card to locally address and execute the data object***, a register comprises a logical identifier of said object ***and at least one first local reference*** and on reception of a first message from a terminal said message comprising said logical identifier of the data object, to communicate to the terminal ***at least one second local reference of the data object, obtained from said at least one first local reference***," (Emphasis added) but asserts that Zuppich does disclose the features.

The Applicants cannot find where the Office Action it is asserted that "a register comprises a logical identifier of said object and *at least one first local reference*." (Emphasis added)

Zuppich does not disclose such register in a microcircuit card, which associates the logical identifier with a local reference of the same data object. Further, Zuppich teaches translation (which potentially requires such a register)

at the terminal end, and not on the microcircuit card. For this reason, the references teach away from combination.

With regards to "reception of a first message from a terminal said message comprising said logical identifier of the data object, to communicate to the terminal at least one second local reference of the data object, obtained from said at least one first local reference." (Emphasis added to show amendment) Support for the amendment may be found, for example, in claim 3. The amendment adds no further search burden and the amendment should be entered as of right. Zuppicich alone or in combination with Lagosanto does not disclose such a feature.

Zuppicich, col.2, lines 25-29 and Fig.6 deals with low level-to-high level language command translation which occurs on a "card reader/writer". This sharply contrasts with the invention where this is the card itself which performs the communication of the (translated) second local reference obtained from the first local reference. For this reason, Zuppicich does not disclose above difference which is in the card.

In addition, instant feature forms part of the solution to remedy to the lack of data object publishing by the card. Since in Zuppicich, the translation is made on the card reader/writer, it is clear that the data objects have been yet published. Therefore, in view of the problem solved by the invention, it is not possible to consider Zuppicich while evading the fact that the translation is made on the card reader/writer

and not on the card. As a consequence, Zuppicich fails to disclose, a circuit card, "a means adapted, on reception of a first message from a terminal, said message including said logical identifier of the data object, to communicate to the terminal at least one second local reference of the data object, obtained from said at least one first local reference."

Claim 10 recites similar features. For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Lagosanto.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is also submitted that claims 1-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr